UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,691	07/17/2003	Tatsuhiko Miyata	501.42784X00	5932

24956   7590   06/15/2007
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD
SUITE 370
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, LONG P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/620,691	MIYATA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Long P. Nguyen	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 12-15* is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) *11* is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 July 2003* is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *See Continuation Sheet*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 3 of Claim 11

recites, "should" which is optional language. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sollee (US 2007/0094412) in view of Moss et al. (US 6,160,876, Hereinafter, Moss).

As for claim 1, Sollee shows a packet communications apparatus for transmitting

a message sent from a caller to a callee, comprising: a processing part having at least

one of two functions **[0038], (Figure 2, #116)**, one function for converting at least part of

a message sent by a caller **[0041]**; and a control part for determining whether said at

least part of the message should be converted **[0038], (Figure 2, #116)**, wherein based

on the result of determination at the control part, at least said part of the message is

converted at the processing part **[0041]**.   But Solle do not shows upon a caller's

request. However Moss shows converting at least part of the message should be

converted upon user request **(Col. 4, line 37-10)**. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the SIP message

conversion of Sollee with the user request of Moss et al. in order to block delivery of the

standard caller ID information for the calling telephone station.

As for claim 2, Sollee shows wherein said the part of the message to be

converted a part identifying a caller's domain in a SIP message header on an IP packet

payload **[0041]** containing the SIP message **[0056]**;

As for claim 3 Sollee shows wherein the contents of the message when received,

are analyzed and with detection of a given character string **[0068]** or header **[0061]**,

[0062], if any, as a start, said at least part of the message is converted at the

processing part **[0070]**.

As for claim 4, Sollee shows a PSTN telephone switch is used to communicate

with SIP Client **(Figure 1)**, but do not shows wherein the given character strings is a

series of numeric characters filled in the first three digits of a telephone number.

However, Moss show wherein the given character strings is a series of numeric

characters filled in the first three digits of a telephone number **(Col. 4 line 37-40)**. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to modify the telephone call network of Sollee with the three digit dialing of

Moss et al. in order to block delivery of the standard caller ID information for calling

telephone station.

As for claim 5, Sollee shows Sollee shows apparatus storing telephone numbers

and UserIDs **[0067]**. But, Sollee do not show wherein the given character string is a

series of numeric characters filled in the first three digits of a telephone number and a

UserID guessed from the telephone number is sent with the first three numeric

characters deleted, and the first three numeric characters are removed at message

sending.   However, Moss show wherein the given character string is a series of

numeric characters filled in the first three digits of a telephone number **(Col. 4 line 37-**

40) and a UserID guessed from the telephone number is sent with the first three

numeric characters **(Col. 5 line 29-40, Note: CallingpartyID is the Directory number),**

and the first three numeric characters are removed at message sending **(Col. 5 line 29-**

40, Note: CallingpartyID is the Directory number with *67 removed). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to

modify the storing UserIDs of Sollee with removing the three digit number of Moss in

order to reduce overhead of the header.

As for claim 6, Sollee shows wherein the given header is a SIP message header

and with detection of an extended header in the SIP message header, if any, as a start,

said at least part of the message is converted **[0059] [0060]**.

As for claim 7, Sollee shows, comprising tables containing both of the

unconverted and converted contents of said at least the part of the message **[0074]**.

As for claim 8, Sollee shows making an IP call comprising the steps of: checking

the SIP message for any request **[0045]**; performing at least one of the operations, of

modification **[0038], (Figure 2, #116)**, on said at least part of the SIP messages if the

request is detected **[0045]**; and sending the SIP message processed as described

above **(Col. 4, line 37-10)**. But Sollee do not shows the request for an Anonymous Call.

However, Moss shows the request for an Anonymous Call **(Col. 5, line 1-5)**. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was

made to modify the SIP system of Sollee with the request of Moss in order to hide the

caller ID.

As for claim 9, Solle shows making an IP call further comprising the steps of:

performing the modification operation on said at least part of the SIP message **[0070]**,

and creating a table containing the correspondence between unconverted and

converted contents of the message **[0067]**. But Sollee do not shows the request for an

Anonymous Call. However, Moss shows the request for an Anonymous Call **(Col. 5,

line 1-5)**. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to modify the SIP system of Sollee with the request of Moss in

order to hide the caller ID.

3.   Claim 10 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Solle view of Moss as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Zhang et al.

(US 2004/0001509, Hereinafter, Zhang).

As for claim 10, Solle shows an IP network **(Abstract)**. But, Solle in view of

Moss do not show making an IP call according to steps of: modifying an original caller's

address to a temporary address at the initiation of a conversation; and discarding the

temporary address at the end of the conversation. However, Zhang shows making an

IP call according to further comprising the steps of: modifying an original caller's address to a temporary address at the initiation of a conversation **[0037]**; and discarding the temporary address at the end of the conversation **[0039]**. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the IP calling network of Solle with the anonymous calls of Moss with the IP translation of Zhang in order to extend the application of IP calls via Ipv4 and Ipv6.

As for claim 12, Solle shows an IP network **(Abstract)**. But, Solle in view of Moss do not show wherein the address is obtained from an external server to use as the caller's address in the case of making an IP call through IPv4. However, Zhang shows wherein the address is obtained from an external server to use as the caller's address in the case of making an IP call through IPv4 **[0042]**. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the IP calling network of Solle with the calling ID of Moss with the DNS server of Zhang in order to interconnect an Ipv4 network and an Ipv6 network (Zhang, [0029]).

As for claim 13, Solle shows an IP network **(Abstract)**. But, Solle in view of Moss do not show wherein the caller's address is the IPv6 address and the address with random values filled is created as the temporary address. However, Zhang shows wherein the caller's address is the IPv6 address **[0021]** and the address with random values filled is created as the temporary address **[0034]**. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify IP calling network of Solle with the anonymous calls of Moss with the random value added to the source address of Zhang in order to help route the packet to NAT-PT (Zhang [0034]).

As for claim 14, Solle shows an IP network **(Abstract)**. But, Solle in view of

Moss do not show wherein the caller's address is the IPv6 or IPv4 address, the address

is first received from an address distribution server in conjunction with message

sending, and the address is discarded at the end of the conversation. However, Zhang

shows wherein the caller's address is the IPv6 or IPv4 address **(Abstract)**, the address

is first received from an address distribution server in conjunction with message sending

[0035], and the address is discarded at the end of the conversation **[0040]**. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

IP calling network of Solle with the anonymous calls of Moss with the return of the

temporary address back into the pool of Zhang in order to reuse the IP address for

another application.

As for claim 15, Solle shows wherein the caller's address is an IP address and

two different addresses **[0079]**, one address for message sending and another address

for message receiving **[0079]**. But Solle in view of Moss do not show the former

address being discarded at the conversation once and immediately after then, a new

one being created while the latter is created at the time of message sending and

discarded at the end of the conversation. However, Zhang shows Ipv6 address **[0037]**,

the former address being discarded at the conversation once and immediately after

[0040] then, a new one being created while the latter is created at the time of message

sending and discarded at the end of the conversation **[0037]**. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify

the address header of Solle with the Ipv6 of Zhang in order to create a pure Ipv6 packet

from Ipv4 packet (Zhang [0037]).

Allowable Subject Matter

4.   Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Long P. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)-272-

9740. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30 - 5:00 EST

Alternate F 7:30-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Doris To can be reached on 571-272-7629. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Long Nguyen

DORIS H. TO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :9/12/2006, 3/23/2006, 07/17/2003.